Document 98

Filed 08/13/2006

Page 1 of 3

Case 1:05-cr-00027

1 2 3

4 5

6 7

8

10 11

12

13

15

16

14

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28 it has routinely used this procedure in this district. The Court concluded by instructing that any party wishing to object must notify the Court by 4:30 that day. The defendant filed this motion at 4:27 the following day, which was a full day after the Court's deadline.

Second, this motion is untimely because it is simply too late to permit the desired response. The defendant filed the motion at the end of the Friday before trial is scheduled to begin, after the clerk's office has closed. The trial starts on Monday. The day of the trial is too late to find and vette a court-appointed interpreter. Furthermore, simply requesting the appointment of a "qualified, neutral interpreter" does not necessarily make one available on the island of Saipan. There are no court-certified interpreters on Saipan. In the court's experience, qualified interpreters are hard to find on Saipan. Furthermore, virtually all of the interpreters on island have worked, at one time or another, for the government or defense attorneys.

II. THE USE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S INTERPRETER IS PROPER.

Accordingly, it is unlikely that there is a "qualified, neutral interpreter" available.

The Government's use of its interpreter is proper as the defendant has made no showing of bias. The defendant bases her allegations primarily on the assumption that the Government will call its neutral interpreter as an expert witness at trial. In fact, the Government plans to use one interpreter and call an entirely different interpreter as its expert witness regarding the translation of certain recordings in this case. Accordingly, there is no concern over the interpreter appearing as a witness adverse to the defendant.

Furthermore, the defendant has not made a showing of bias simply because the Government's interpreter is a contract linguist for the FBI. See Siripongs v. Calderon, 35 F.3d 1308, 1318 (9th Cir. 1994). As discussed above, on Saipan, the interpreters routinely work for one side or the other. Additionally, there are procedural safeguards present. First, the interpreter will be bound by the oath taken pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 604. Second, as the Court suggested, the defendants will have their interpreters present who can raise any issues with the translation by way of objection.

The Court has discretion to use the Government's interpreter under 28 U.S.C. § 1827, because, in the absence of "certified interpreters," the Court must use otherwise qualified

1	interpreters. In fact, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1827(c)(2), the "United States attorney is
2	responsible for securing the services of such interpreters for government witnesses." (emphasis
3	added.) There can be no question about the qualifications of the Government's interpreter, who
4	is a contract linguist for the the FBI; holds a B.A. equivalent degree in English from Xian
5	Foreign Languages University in China and an M.A. in English as a Second Language from
6	Azusa Pacific University; and she spent twenty years in China.
7	III. CONCLUSION
8	For the reasons stated above, the Government respectfully requests that the Court deny
9	the defendant's motion for court appointed interpreter and follow the procedure previously
10	instituted.
11	
12	Dated: August 13, 2006 Saipan, CNMI
13	LEONARDO M. RAPADAS
14	United States Attorney District of the Northern Mariana Islands
15	
16	By:/s/ TIMOTHY E. MORAN
17	Assistant U.S. Attorney
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

Filed 08/13/2006 Page 3 of 3